

REMARKS

This paper is presented in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed May 29, 2009, and is accompanied by a request for a three-month extension of time and the appropriate fee for such an extension.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the patent to Shimose (US Patent No. 6,203,918). The Examiner stated that Shimose disclosed a laminate comprising a stainless steel base layer coated with polyimide layers and an electrical conductor (relying on the patent's Abstract). The Examiner urged that "the polyimide layer reads on the claimed heat resistant layer, the electrolytic copper foil reads on the claimed metallic foil, and the stainless steal base layer reads on the claimed film-like protective layer".

By this Amendment, applicants have amended claim 6 and added new claims 8 and 9.

Applicants have considered the Examiner's reasons for rejecting claims 6 and 7 but have determined that there is no disclosure by the Shimose patent to support an anticipation rejection of applicants' invention as now claimed.

In particular, applicants invention improves upon the prior art described in paragraph [0007] of the present application wherein a method is taught to minimize or eliminate visual defects that can occur during the thermal lamination process – a method wherein a film-like protective material is disposed between a pressurized surface and the outside of the metallic foil at the time of lamination (see paragraph [0039] of applicants' disclosure).

The method of applicants employs take-up means, and delivery means, for take-up and delivery of the protective material. This aspect of the method described by applicants is discussed in paragraph [0046] of the application wherein apparatus is disclosed for taking up and delivering the protective material. Paragraph [0046] further states “When these taking up means for the protective material, and delivery means for the protective material are provided, re-use of the protective material may be possible by disposing again, in a delivery side, the protective material that are already used once and taken up in the thermal lamination process. Moreover, when taking up the protective material, detection means of end positions for arranging both ends of the protective material and an adjusting means of taking up location may be provided. Since these means can arrange both ends of the protective material and take up with sufficient precision, efficiency of re-use can be increased.”

The film-like protective material of applicants’ invention is removed or peeled from the laminate after thermal lamination (paragraph [0046] of the present disclosure), while the stainless steel base layer of Shimose is not removed or peeled from the laminate inasmuch as it is a part of the laminate.

Thus, paragraph [0046] provides the basis for reciting the inventive aspect that the protective layer in the present invention is removable from the lamination and reusable, as specifically set forth in new claim 9.

Applicants’ amended claim 6 recites a laminate that comprises a heat resistant adhesive material layer and a metallic foil layer having a film-like protective material that is disposed on the outside of the metallic foil between a pressurized surface and the metallic foil.

In contrast, the patent to Shimose teaches (paragraph 4 of the Examiner's rejection) that the laminate formed by the patent includes a stainless steel base layer (which the Examiner says reads on the claimed film-like protective material) coated with polyimide layers (which the Examiner says reads on the claimed heat resistant adhesive) and an electrical conductor layer (which the Examiner says reads on the claimed metallic foil), in that order.

Per the Examiner in paragraph 5 of the Action, the stainless steel layer reads on the claimed film-like protective material.

However, the patent to Shimose teaches that the stainless steel layer must be disposed adjacent to a pressurized surface in order to effect a lamination, and that after lamination the stainless steel layer remains with the lamination, not removed by being peeled off and not being re-used as taught and now claimed by applicants.

Further, Example 1 in Shimose discloses the lamination as including:

- (a) a pressurized surface,
- (b) electrolytic copper foil,
- (c) layers of polyimides,
- (d) stainless steel foil, and
- (e) a pressurized surface,

in that order. Per the Examiner, (b) is regarded as the metallic foil, (e) as the pressurized surface and (d) as the film-like protective material. Yet the applicants' pressurized surface is (a), and the stainless steel foil layer in the patent is not disposed outside of the electrolytic copper foil layer (b).

For all the foregoing reasons, and in view of the amendments presented or referred to in this response, applicants respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejections applied in the Final Rejection, and request an allowance of the claims presently under consideration in this application.

If the Examiner has any questions or requires further information or explanation, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of applicants,



Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386

CHAN LAW GROUP LLP
www.chanlaw.com
1055 West 7th Street, Suite 1880
Los Angeles, California 90017-2544
Tel: 213 225-2604
Fax: 213 622-1154